DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 300 HE 006 428

AUTHOR Durzo, Joseph J.
TITLE Instructional Development with Many Masters: A Cooperative Program for Academic Change.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 75
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D. C., April 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Development; Educational Innovation; *Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *New Hampshire College and Univ Council; NHCUC

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the impact of organizational context on the nature of instructional development programs and on the role of instructional developers. This paper describes the effort of a consortium of higher education institutions, the New Hampshire College and University Council (NHCUC) to establish an instructional development program. Reasons for attempting a consortium instructional development program, a brief description of the NHCUC and an overview of the consortium movement are provided as a framework for discussion of the issues and questions related to the implementation of a consortium instructional development program. (Author)

ED104300

AERA SESSION # 5.05

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH MANY MASTERS: A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR ACADEMIC CHANGE

Joseph J. Durzo
New Hampshire College and University Council
Manchester, New Hampshire

March 31, 1975

Presented at the symposium "Instructional Development: The Importance of Organizational Context," at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RE006428

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the symposium is to discuss the impact of organizational context on the nature of instructional development programs and on the role of instructional developers. This paper describes the effort of a consortium of higher education institutions, the New Hampshire College and University Council (NHCUC), to establish an instructional development program. Reasons for attempting a consortium instructional development program, a brief description of the NHCUC and an overview of the consortium movement are provided as a framework for discussion of the issues and questions related to the implementation of a consortium instructional development program.

PRESSURE FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION

The pressure for increased efforts to improve academic quality in the nation's small colleges in a time of fiscal pressure and retrenchment is forcing these colleges to search for cost-efficient methods of meeting this need. In times of decreasing enrollments and increasing costs, colleges cannot afford to lose students who leave because they find the academic program to be rigid, boring and unsatisfying. But this is exactly the situation in many small institutions. The final report of a Cooperative Curriculum Project of the NHCUC colleges indicated that, during the last three years, the annual attrition rate at many of the colleges ranged from 1/6 to 1/3 of the student body. As a result of this problem, the NHCUC colleges face the difficult and expensive task of recruiting freshmen and transfer students to replace those who leave before graduation.

Astin and Lee (1971) concluded that small, private colleges in the United States are in real danger of extinction unless aid and answers commensurate with their problems are provided. A major effort to increase the quality and effectiveness of these colleges is imperative in the struggle to provide a wide range of diverse, high-quality, higher education opportunities for students.

In a search for solutions to these problems, the Cooperative Curriculum Project Committee (1974) of the New Hampshire College and University Council (NHCUC) concluded that:

> Nationwide, it appears that effective faculty/instructional development programs create a more satisfying and attractive curriculum which may increase admissions and decrease attrition rates. Such a program then, ought to be given a high priority.

Colleges and universities which can afford to do so are beginning to organize professionally-staffed instructional development agencies to support the efforts of their faculty members (Alexander and Yelon, 1972). Ironically, those colleges which could benefit most from such help are often unable to provide it for themselves. Small colleges cannot afford to provide their faculty members with the services of a staff of instructional development specialists. Diamond, et. al. (1975) have indicated that the cost of beginning an instructional development program on a campus might be almost $60,000 [p. 24]. This amount of money puts instructional development help out of reach of most small colleges, yet these small poor institutions could potentially benefit a great deal from effective instructional development programs.

In order to overcome the financial constraints, the Cooperative Curriculum Project Committee of the NHCUC (1974) recommended that the Council take cooperative action to provide a service that its members cannot provide for themselves:

> The NHCUC should provide certain professional services to the faculty of the NHCUC colleges that the colleges are unable to provide themselves. We refer specifically to a program of faculty and instructional development. It is our opinion that a direct assault on improving teaching skills and on adapting the curriculum to the needs of varied students and new kinds of subject matter will be of more lasting benefit to NHCUC students and colleges than will a concentration on "salvage" efforts focused upon achieving greater economic efficiency [pp. 15-16]. (emphasis mine)

A New Direction for the NHCUC

How may a consortium of higher education institutions most effectively implement an instructional development program intended to improve the teaching-learning process on the campuses of its members? The pressure for cooperative action has moved the NHCUC into an area of unexplored consortium activity:

providing direct assistance to member institutions which desire to engage in academic redesign. Very little information is available to guide the development of a consortium instructional development program, yet such a program may be the only practical alternative for New Hampshire's small colleges to provide such a service to their faculties. Other cooperative programs administered by the NHCUC provide services to the institutions which they cannot provide for themselves. It was logical, therefore, that the colleges should turn to the NHCUC for assistance in instructional development.

A Brief Description of the NHCUC

The NHCUC, founded in 1966, is a consortium composed of thirteen public and private higher education institutions in New Hampshire. The institutions range in size and scope from small liberal arts colleges to the University of New Hampshire which enrolls nearly 10,000 students. (See the appendix for a brief description of the NHCUC institutions.)

The NHCUC, through its members, bears a significant part of the responsibility for higher education in New Hampshire. Member institutions presently enroll over 4/5 of the senior college students, employ over 2/3 of the faculty, and confer more than 2/3 of all advanced degrees granted in the state.

NHCUC institutions have joined together in programs of interinstitutional cooperation for the advancement of higher education through mutual assistance. Joint purchasing, a joint financial aids office, inter-library projects, joint placement and admissions projects have saved money for individual members. Cooperative academic ventures such as a joint marine science project, student exchange agreement, and joint curriculum development offer a broader educational package without costly unilateral facility development.

THE CONSORTIUM MOVEMENT

The cooperation exhibited by the NHCUC institutions is not unique. Across the nation the increasing pressures on higher education have given rise to a

growing movement toward cooperation among colleges and universities in an effort to solve their mutual problems.

Strictly speaking, however, interinstitutional cooperative arrangements in American higher education are not a recent development. The formation of the Claremont Colleges voluntary association in California in 1925 is generally accepted as the beginning of the consortium movement in the United States (Moore, 1968; F. Patterson, 1974; L. Patterson, 1970).

However, despite its early beginnings, the major growth of the consortium movement did not begin until recently. Lewis Patterson (1970, p. 1) illustrated the "newness" of the movement with a chart of the founding dates of the 51 consortia listed in the 1970 Directory of Academic Cooperative Arrangements:

1925-48	1953-58	1961-64	1965-70
4	5	10	35

Numerous authors have offered explanations of the pressures which have contributed to the growth of the number of consortia (Bunnel & Johnson, 1965; E. Johnson, 1967; F. Patterson, 1974; L. Patterson, 1971, and others). Swegan's comment (1972) is indicative of their views:

> Perhaps the stress and pressures on higher education in the decades ahead will necessitate a more balanced proportion of cooperation and competition if institutions are to survive. This statement is particularly true for the many private liberal arts colleges which face the rapidly growing problems of escalating costs, increased specialization and technologic demands within most curricular areas, and the erosion of their financial resources.
>
> The economically embattled smaller institutions should and must look to the consortium as one of the possible sources for meeting some of the demands placed on all institutions of higher learning [p. 33].

Franklin Patterson (1974) observed that more than one-half of the 80 consortia in existence at the time of his writing had been founded in the previous five years. In addition, he noted that 12 new consortia are being established each year, with an attrition rate of approximately one per year [pp. 3-4].

The Nature of Cooperative Arrangements

Cooperation among higher education institutions takes many forms, ranging from informal exchanges of students and faculty to formal multipurpose arrangements.

Lewis Patterson (1971) described two major categories of cooperative arrangements: (1) voluntary cooperative arrangements and (2) involuntary or statutory cooperative arrangements. Involuntary arrangements are established by statutes and voluntary arrangements are developed through the mutual consent of the member institutions. The following outline illustrates the major types of involuntary and voluntary arrangements:

Involuntary or Statutory

1. State, County and District Systems of Institutions
2. Interstate Compacts
3. Reciprocal Arrangements

Voluntary or Non-Statutory

1. Fund-Raising Associations
2. Lobbying Organizations
3. Academic Purpose Associations and Arrangements

(L. Patterson, 1970, p.2)

Patterson (1970) went further and developed five criteria which are now generally accepted as a working definition of "consortium." He defined a consortium as a cooperative arrangement which meets the following criteria:

> Each consortium: (1) is a voluntary formal organization, (2) has three or more member institutions, (3) implements multi-academic programs, (4) employs at least one full-time professional to administer consortium programs, and (5) has a required annual contribution or other tangible evidence of long-term commitment of member institutions [p. 3].

The use of the term "consortium" in this paper refers to interinstitutional arrangements which fall within the limits of Patterson's working definition.

Purposes of Consortia

In 1971, Patterson [p. 20] described six general purposes of consortia:

1. To improve the quality of educational programs and institutional operations
2. To expand educational opportunities
3. To facilitate change

4. To relate the institutions more effectively to their communities
5. To achieve economies
6. To raise funds

Other writers generally agree with Patterson's list, though some offer additional goals or more detailed statements of consortium purposes (Bradley, 1971; Bunnel & Johnson, 1965; Kreplin & Bolce, 1973; Nelsen, 1972; Swegan, 1972).

Going beyond the general list of goals, Kreplin and Bolce (1973) concluded that "Interinstitutional cooperation represents a form of interorganizational change, and one objective of interinstitutional cooperation is to effect change within individual institutions [p. 5]." Among the possible roles and goals for consortia, Nelsen (1972) argued that "Consortia must begin to play the roles of educational entrepreneurs and innovators more so than they ever have before..., to work in untested areas and lead the way [p. 545]."

Responding to criticism of the inactivity of consortia in bringing about "basic changes" within their members, Grupe (1974) replied:

> Consortia have no inherent ability to elicit more creative educational changes than would normally emerge from colleges independently. Consortia are primarily organizational solutions to certain types of organizational problems. They are enabling innovations that permit other changes to occur. It may be that consortia have not been overly productive in initiating "basic changes," whatever that term means, but until recently, this was never expected of them...The question should be asked: Can academic consortia be more effective in bringing about change within their members, as well as among them [pp. 12-13]? (emphasis mine)

Consortia and Academic Change

The pressures for academic innovation in a time of financial pressure and retrenchment are forcing small colleges to look to external sources such as consortia for help. Consortia, however, have very little experience in providing programs to carry out academic innovation within their members' institutions. This inexperience is reflected by the lack of literature documenting such efforts.

Grupe (1972), F. Patterson (1974), Schwenkenmeyer and Goodman (1972) and others have described various cooperative academic programs, including: cross-

listing of courses, shared faculty, student exchange, joint use of laboratory facilities and the like. They have also discussed consortium faculty development programs intended to help faculty members improve their teaching skills. However, none of these efforts has involved consortium staff members directly as change agents attempting to assist the schools in carrying out systematic courses redesign efforts.

A review of the literature about consortia has revealed no references to consortium-based instructional development programs designed to assist the members with course redesign efforts on individual campuses. A search of the NEXUS information referral service of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) in January, 1975, failed to produce any references to consortium-based instructional development programs (Lichtman, 1975). Correspondence with Lewis Patterson (1975), the Cooperative Program Coordinator of AAHE, also failed to produce examples of consortium-based instructional development efforts.

AN EXPERIMENT WITH LONG-DISTANCE DEVELOPMENT

Despite a lack of information on which to base a consortium instructional development effort, the NHCUC responded to its members' recommendations and began to search for a way to provide instructional development help. In the summer of 1973, the NHCUC provided funds to send a dean and a faculty member from each NHCUC institution to a week-long seminar on instructional development run by the staff of the Center for Instructional Development (CID) at Syracuse University.

As a result of the enthusiasm and interest generated by the seminar, the NHCUC arranged a one-day conference on faculty development and instructional development in October, 1973. Nearly one hundred faculty members and administrators from the NHCUC colleges attended the session. The staff of the Center for Instructional Development at Syracuse University presented a description and discussion of

case studies of the Center's developmental efforts at Syracuse. A concurrent session on faculty development was also held at the conference.

At the request of Dean John Maes of Franklin Pierce College (one of the NHCUC institutions) following the conference, the NHCUC began an experiment with long-distance instructional development. Maes suggested that a series of workshops on instructional development involving faculty members from several institutions should be planned. Dr. Paul Eickmann of CID at Syracuse was contacted and agreed to work with NHCUC on this experiment. However, at Eickmann's suggestion, the focus of the effort was changed from workshops to actual instructional development projects at several campuses. Eickmann felt that by attempting to engage in actual development projects, the NHCUC might produce tangible results which could be useful to the participating colleges.

The experiment was essentially a feasibility study to determine whether instructional development on NHCUC campuses could be accomplished by an external instructional development consultant. The NHCUC staff reasoned that if it were possible for this approach to succeed, then it might be possible for the NHCUC to provide instructional development assistance to its members from a cooperatively-funded central office.

Three colleges were chosen to participate in the experiment: Franklin Pierce College, Keene State College, and New England College. Deans from each college requested participation by various faculty members. Paul Eickmann then met with the faculty and deans of the colleges and suggested the "ground rules" for the experimental development projects and the role of CID in the projects (NHCUC, 1974, pp. 1-2):

1. The college representatives must choose a subject based on institutional priorities.

2. CID does not and will not dictate course content. The faculty who are going to teach the course must make the content decisions. CID people will question and challenge content decisions, but final decision on content must be made by the faculty.

3. CID is not interested in working with all faculty or "converting" faculty to "their" methods. Faculty who are currently successful in their efforts should stick to what they're doing. CID has refused to work with faculty when evaluation shows they are doing well, even if the faculty member wants to change. CID does not have a method to which they try to convert faculty.

   There is no one way that all students learn best, nor one way that all faculty teach best. CID desires only to help faculty who are uneasy with their present efforts to find an alternative instructional design which will prove more satisfactory to both faculty and students.

Projects chosen by the three colleges were:

1. A redesign of freshman composition at Keene State College.
2. A computer "course" at Franklin Pierce College.
3. A redesign of the music curriculum at New England College.
4. A course in science for non-majors at New England College.

From December, 1973, through May, 1974, Eickmann travelled to New Hampshire for project meetings approximately once every three weeks. While most of the projects produced some useful results, the most successful program was a re-designed Freshman English Course at Keene State College. The Keene faculty designed a prototype composition course which was pilot-tested with 100 students in the Fall of 1974. Emphasis in the course was placed on diagnosis and remediation of writing problems and exemption of students from activities depending on their abilities. The program may eventually offer variable credit and optional mini-courses. Presently, students are allowed to work at their own pace, even if it means going beyond the traditional one-semester time frame.

The prototype program was evaluated by the Keene English Department during the fall semester and modifications, including the use of student tutors, were incorporated for the spring semester. In the Fall of 1975, the program will be expanded to include 240 students. This program provides students with much more individual help than was possible before and also provides mechanisms for closer monitoring of student performance. A student's specific problems are discovered sooner and diagnosed more clearly. Specific remedial work is then assigned under the guidance of faculty members and student tutors on an individual basis.

At Franklin Pierce College, the Computer Group conducted a pilot-test of a non-credit computer mini-course. A preliminary re-design was produced for the introductory computer courses. The Science Project at New England College was abandoned by mutual agreement because it didn't represent a sufficiently high institutional priority. The Music Project was halted because a key faculty member expected to go on a one-year sabbatical for the following year.

Results of the Long-Distance Development Experiment

The results of the experimental long-distance development effort have been quite positive:

1. We have shown that an external instructional developer can be successfully involved in the academic change process at NHCUC member institutions.
2. Faculty have expressed a need for assistance in instructional development. Workshops that NHCUC has offered in this area have been very well attended and have generated several course design project requests.
3. Faculty and staff expressed sufficient enthusiasm and demonstrated sufficient need for a consortium instructional development program to persuade the NHCUC Board of Directors to support a full-time instructional development specialist on the NHCUC staff.

Consequently, in the Fall of 1974, the NHCUC hired a full-time instructional development specialist to continue the projects begun during the long-distance development experiment program and to explore the feasibility of mounting a full-scale instructional development program through the consortium office. As a result of one semester's work, four colleges which <u>had not</u> been involved in the initial experimental program asked for assistance. To date, these four additional colleges have requested help to redesign more than 30 courses. In addition, requests have been received for help in general curriculum development and course evaluation efforts.

IMPACT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Because very little information was available to guide the development of the NHCUC program, it was necessary to devote a substantial amount of time to the consideration of the implications of the organizational context for our program. This section describes our initial responses to some of the questions and issues which were raised by the consideration of our context.

1) *SHOULD THE NHCUC PROGRAM EMPHASIZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTS OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SKILLS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS?*

The answer to this question comes, in part, from a consideration of the nature of the NHCUC. The NHCUC is a voluntary consortium composed of thirteen markedly different institutions: public and private, religiously affiliated and non-denominational, small and large. In essence, NHCUC is an external agency which is not a part of any particular institution. The consortium staff is not a part of any individual institution and is thus external to the structure of all of the institutions. Consequently, any NHCUC staff member who works to foster change within the institutions will be in the role of external change agent. The faculty and administrators who work on academic redesign projects will, of course, be internal change agents by virtue of their position within the institution.

Short-Term Goal

These two sets of change agents will have different priorities for the NHCUC instructional development program. For the faculty and administrators (internal change agents), the priority will be on products. They will (at least initially) be primarily concerned with solving some real instructional problem at their institution. Their goal will be to develop some product: e.g., a redesigned course, a new curriculum for adult learners, or a flexible credit and registration system.

Certainly a great deal of effort should be placed on direct assistance to the colleges to help them develop solutions to instructional problems.

This is both desirable and necessary since such solutions will have an immediate beneficial impact for students. But any specific instructional solution is bound by place and by time. Students change, instructional problems change, colleges change and society changes. Real, long-term benefit will accrue only to those institutions which develop an increased capacity to carry out a successful academic redesign program. Consequently, while we view this product focus as a desirable short-range goal, we must also work toward the long-range goal.

Long-Range Goal

As external change agents, the NHCUC instructional development staff will be concerned with a long-range goal: Assisting the institutions to become more effective in solving instructional problems on their own. In the ideal situation, the NHCUC staff would assist the institutions to solve their own problems and eventually succeed in building up the skills of the staffs of the institutions to such a level that they would no longer need outside assistance to solve their instructional problems. We realize that the ideal may be beyond our grasp, but the image of the ideal state of affairs is useful in guiding our program.

2) WHAT ROLES MUST THE NHCUC DEVELOPMENT STAFF PLAY IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH BOTH THE SHORT-RANGE COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND LONG-RANGE SKILL DEVELOPMENT GOALS?

Three objectives have been identified as a means of accomplishing these goals: Objective 1--Course Design, Objective 2--Skill Development, Objective 3--Exchange of Information and Dissemniation of Results. Each of these objectives implies different roles for the instructional developer.

Objective 1 - Course Design

NHCUC will assist faculty and administrators in the process of redesigning courses or programs which they feel could benefit from a systematic redesign effort. Projects undertaken will generally be courses or programs identified by the institution as high priority projects.

Academic redesign is not easy to accomplish. It can often be a frustrating and traumatic experience. The kind of long-range, systemic change needed to solve complex academic problems requires the commitment of talented faculty, and full administrative support from the institution. A major academic redesign effort requires the support and interaction of many talented people, working in a purposeful direction. To accomplish this objective, the NHCUC instructional development and evaluation staff will form instructional development teams with the faculty and administrators to work through the course design/redesign process.

The developers will act as process consultants, helping the other members of the team to raise and deal with the complicated issues involved in a course design effort. As a process consultant, the developer is responsible for helping the faculty members move from initial conceptual considerations to the implementation of a redesigned course. Among the roles the developer will play are: (1) a resource person with knowledge about design alternatives, (2) a devil's advocate who asks difficult questions on key issues, (3) a friend who helps his/her teammates over difficult hurdles, and (4) an external agent who acts as a liaison with the administration of the institution. Underlying all of these roles, however, is the belief that a process consultant must help his/her clients understand how to identify problems and issues, come to decisions, and generate solutions in order to help them develop their skills while solving their problems.

Objective 2 - Skill Development

To accomplish this objective the NHCUC will help faculty and administrators improve their skills in the process of academic redesign and innovation in order to make the most effective use of available resources on each campus.

We realize, however, that we must work toward the long-range goal of enabling the NHCUC institutions to become more effective in solving instructional

problems on their own. Faculty members and administrators are, of course, the keys to this long-range goal. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education (1974) emphasized the necessity of a faculty development emphasis in any program intended to create academic innovation. Ullmer and Lakenas (1971) and others also noted that successful curricular innovation is dependent on faculty members becoming instructional developers in their own right. Most authorities on instructional development believe that in order to help faculty acquire these skills, instructional development programs must strike an effective balance between course development and people development.

The external change agents (NHCUC staff) must work with the internal change agents (faculty and administrators) to help them acquire the necessary skills to carry out academic redesign on their own. A first step in this process is the use of the team approach to instructional development, and the careful consideration of each step in the instructional development process by the members of the team. Professional growth occurs as a natural "by-product" of this type of intensive course design effort as the faculty members wrestle with the many content and process questions which arise. The growth experiences of faculty who participate in course design projects represent a first step toward our goal of instructional self-sufficiency. We realize that in order to meet our long-range goal, the NHCUC must make a concerted effort to help faculty and administrators build the skills which are necessary to implement a program of academic redesign. A series of workshops, seminars, consultant visits and other experiences will be planned to maximize both faculty growth and the course design effort.

In order to accomplish this objective the developers will have to take on the role of instructor, workshop coordinator, or educational broker. It is likely that NHCUC will provide "experiences" for faculty and administrators in three topic areas: (1) the Instructional Development Process, (2) Alternatives to Traditional Programs, and (3) Support for Academic Change.

The experiences of NHCUC to date have shown that it is frequently both more effective and more efficient to support the attendance of key institutional personnel at "outside" seminars rather than try to mount programs ourselves. For instance, early enthusiasm for a redesigned freshman composition program at Keen State College is attributable largely to the attendance of the dean from Keene State at an instructional development seminar offered by Syracuse University. Where there do not seem to be appropriate seminars or programs being offered by others, we will design and operate programs ourselves to fill the gap.

Objective 3 - Exchange of Information and Dissemination of Results

The third objective of the NHCUC program seems, at first glance, to be deceptively simple and obvious. However, Objective Three is, in its own right, as important as the first two objectives. As discussed earlier, the basic problem of New Hampshire's invisible colleges is "limited resources." Objective Three is vital to the program because it is a major means by which our limited resources can be maximized. Even if our instructional development program is effective, the institutions will still have only limited resources to bring to bear on their problems. Our efforts to exchange information and disseminate results represents a way of extending the impact of those resources.

The redesigned "courses" which will result from Objective One will provide models which will help stimulate the imagination of other faculty members. Often faculty continue to use only traditional lecture formats because they are unfamiliar with alternative approaches. In order to provide a stimulus for thought, we must be certain that information about redesign efforts is circulated as widely as possible among our colleges. One productive way to do this is with a "discipline workshop." Having had success with the freshman composition course at Keene State College, the faculty of the departments of English from each of our colleges have been invited to a workshop on freshman

composition at which the Keene project will be the focus for discussion. By limiting the attendance to English faculty, the size of the workshop is kept small and an informal atmosphere is maintained. Because the workshop participants are all specialists in English, they have a common framework for discussion, and the conversation can be directed toward specific issues and recommendations.

Naturally, "discipline workshops" are not the only way to transmit information, nor would we restrict ourselves only to that one technique. But it is a method that has proved very successful in stimulating the imagination of our faculty members.

Objective Two of the program, which is designed to increase faculty skills in the area of academic redesign, will create a core of trained local resource people who will be able to assist their colleagues from their own colleges or from other colleges to implement redesign projects. In order to maximize this resource, we must publicize it. Therefore, in addition to a continuous series of workshops or seminars designed to highlight the ongoing course development effort, we will send out a periodic newsletter to all faculty summarizing the results of development projects and announcing various seminars and skill workshops. By keeping faculty informed of the network of expertise available at no cost to them, we are more likely to generate the on-campus follow-up which is essential if the seminar information is to be put to work. The dissemination of results is the key to maximizing the impact of the entire NHCUC instructional development effort within New Hampshire.

To accomplish this objective the NHCUC development staff will act as coordinators and facilitators to create an information network which will enable faculty and administrators in NHCUC institutions to take advantage of their colleagues' experiences in academic redesign.

3) SINCE THIS IS A CONSORTIUM PROGRAM, MUST A PROJECT HAVE AN INTERINSTITUTIONAL FOCUS?

During the initial discussions about the direction of the NHCUC instructional development program, it was suggested that because NHCUC is a consortium, course development projects should be interinstitutional in nature. It was decided, however, that the criterion of a multi-campus focus is inappropriate. The purpose of the NHCUC instructional development program is to assist individual institutions to solve their instructional problems. To require that the solution to these problems be interinstitutional in nature would be as inappropriate as assuming beforehand that the solution should be a series of slide-tape presentations. The solution to an institution's instructional problem requires a careful analysis of the problem and the design of a solution which is tailored to solve that problem. If it were the case that an interinstitutional "course" is an appropriate solution to a problem, then the NHCUC would, of course, assist the institutions involved to achieve that goal.

4) NHCUC IS A CONSORTIUM COMPOSED OF THIRTEEN INSTITUTIONS. HOW WILL COURSE DESIGN PROJECTS BE SELECTED SO THAT SERVICES ARE DISTRIBUTED FAIRLY AMONG THE MEMBER INSTITUTIONS?

Given the limited resources available for the program, it is imperative that the course design projects reflect the priorities of the individual institutions. In addition, since this is a consortium program, we must be careful to be fair to all of our members in apportioning our services.

Criteria

In order to guide the selection of course design projects, a set of criteria have been developed to: (1) assist the NHCUC staff to select projects which are important to the individual institutions, and (2) ensure that course design assistance will be apportioned fairly among the institutions. An advisory committee of academic deans from NHCUC colleges approved the following criteria:

I. INTERNAL (INTRA-INSTITUTIONAL) CRITERIA

1) The project must have support from:
   a. Administration
   b. Department Chairpersons
   c. Faculty members in the department

2) The project should be a high priority for the institution.

3) Faculty to be involved must be genuinely interested and committed to a development effort and willing to go through all of the steps involved in the development process.

4) The project should have high impact for students (e.g., larger enrollment courses).

5) Sufficient time must be available to complete a development effort. (Don't expect a complete course redesign in 3 weeks.)

6) Conditions related to departmental and institutional politics should be favorable to a development effort.

II. EXTERNAL (INTERINSTITUTIONAL) CRITERIA

1) If all internal criteria are satisfied, then first priority will be given to project requests from colleges which do not already have projects in progress.

2) In general, new projects should not duplicate efforts underway on other campuses. (Alternative means will be found to work on problems affecting a large number of colleges.)

3) Project selection should be directed toward providing assistance (on request) to all types of schools -- e.g., public, private, large, medium, or small.

4) Projects should arise spontaneously from the needs of the colleges. No attempt should be made by the NHCUC to "force" a school into a project.

5) The project should be a wise use of NHCUC resources.

The NHCUC Deans were asked to arrange meetings with faculty members and department chairpersons responsible for courses which might benefit from a design effort so that we could explain the goals and procedures of our design effort. Following these meetings, project request forms were sent to the deans who were asked to make them available to interested faculty. After the requests were received by NHCUC, the instructional development staff met with the dean to determine whether the project met the criteria. Work began on projects which met both the internal and external criteria.

5) *HOW DOES THE MULTI-CAMPUS CONSORTIUM SETTING AFFECT THE PROCESS OF DOING INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT?*

The developer working as an external change agent faces difficulties in understanding the setting in which (s)he is working. Lyon (1974, p.3) has noted that an external instructional developer is often isolated from the information "grapevine" on individual campuses because (s)he is not a member of the campus community:

> There will be no firsthand information on the interactions of various individuals and departments. There will be no "gut reactions" to predict the responses of vital support personnel. There will be no warning of possible "traps" created by unfortunate past experiences. Such information as may be available will come from sources who are themselves relatively unknown to the developer and thus suspect.
>
> This type of development setting is very susceptible to the manipulation of individual vested interests because the developer is at a great disadvantage in trying to separate fact from fiction. For example, in a situation in which a dean and a group of faculty view each other as major stumbling blocks to change, how does the developer sort out the truth? Overcoming the inertia of such a situation can be terribly complex under the best of conditions but for the non-resident developer it is practically impossible.
>
> The non-resident developer will also be handicapped during the development process by his lack of information gathering potential. He is not in a position to receive feedback after each session and is not therefore aware of difficulties that may arise between meetings. Worse yet, even if he becomes aware of these things, he is in an awkward position to take corrective action. His visits are much more "formal". "Accidental" meetings are harder to arrange for the non-resident developer

Lyon (1974) also described the logistical problems which may be encountered by an external, consortium instructional developer. His point is that because of the geographic separation of the NHCUC institutions, the developer must invest a considerable amount of time in travel in order to conduct meetings on distant campuses. This travel time makes casual meetings difficult to arrange and, in fact, may reduce the number of course design projects which a developer can handle.

IMPACT BEYOND NEW HAMPSHIRE

The larger question raised by this project is how to implement instructional development services for a consortium of colleges. Seymour Sarason (1972) emphasized both the utility of information about the creation of new programs and the lack of such information. He noted that many new programs fail because they have no examples on which to base their efforts. Our project will be a first step in exploring a hitherto unexplored consortium activity: providing direct assistance to member institutions for systematically redesigning their academic programs. This project will provide a uniquely valuable case study in the implementation of such services. Other consortia considering ways to assist their members will find information about the NHCUC program very helpful in their attempts to create settings for academic innovation.

As declining enrollments and spiraling inflation continue to erode institutional resources, more and more colleges will find themselves in a position similar to the small colleges of New Hampshire: in critical need of improving the academic quality of their programs, but without the resources to do so. The model proposed here may be an efficient and effective way of improving academic quality at an affordable cost. If we can demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach, it may provide new resources which may be used in the struggle to preserve a truly diverse system of higher education.

NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE
New London, NH 03257
President: Dr. Louis Vaccaro
Academic Dean: Dr. Wallace Ewing

Women; some men in selected programs. Private and Independent. Nine Associate and ten Bachelor Degree programs in Liberal Arts and professional areas. 610 Students.

FRANCONIA COLLEGE
Franconia, NH 03580
President: Mr. Leon Botstein
Academic Dean: Dr. David Osher

Coeducational. Private. Non-Sectarian and Experimental. Associate Degrees in Liberal Arts, B.A. Degrees in Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, Performing Arts, and Education. 484 students.

FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE
Rindge, NH 03461
President: Dr. Frank DiPietro
Academic Dean: Dr. John Maes

Coeducational. Private. Non-Sectarian. B.A. Degree. Majors include Anthropology, Biology, Creative and Performing Arts, Economics and Management, English, History, Modern Languages, Mathematics, Psychology and Sociology. 818 students. First Graduate Program: The LAW CENTER, Concord, NH 03301. First and second year. Third year begins September, 1975. J.D. Degree. 212 students.

KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Keene, NH 03431
President: Dr. Leo Redfern
Academic Dean: Dr. Clarence Davis

Coeducational. Associate Degrees in Technical Education. Baccalaureate Degrees in Liberal Arts and Education. Master Degree in Education. 2,302 students.

MOUNT ST. MARY COLLEGE
Hooksett, NH 03106
President: Sr. Amy Hoey
Academic Dean: Sr. Joanne Bibeau

Women. Private and independently operated by Sisters of Mercy. A.A. and B.A. Degrees in Biology, Business Management, Elementary Education, English, French, History, Home Economics, Mathematics, Social Work, Spanish. 250 students.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE COLLEGE
Antrim, NH 03440
President: Dr. Kenneth McLaughlin
Academic Dean: Dr. Raymond Smith

Coeducational. Private and Independent. A.A., A.S., Associate in Business Science. B.A., B.S., B.S. in Business Administration. A.S. in Professional Pilot and Aviation Administration. 600 students.

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE
Henniker, NH 03242
President: Dr. J. Kenneth Cummiskey
Academic Dean: Dr. Erwin Jaffe

Coeducational. Private and Independent. Degrees Offered: B.A., B.S. Professional programs in Teacher Education, Business Administration, and Engineering. 1,435* students in Henniker; 135 in Arundel, Sussex, England campus.
* includes 263 in Diploma Nurse Program.

NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE
Manchester, NH 03104
President: Mr. Edward Shapiro
Academic Dean: Dr. James Grace

Private. Coeducational. Non-Sectarian. Independent. Associate Degrees in seven professional areas and General Studies. Baccalaureate Degrees in eleven professional areas. Master of Business Administration Degrees in Accounting, Business Education, Business Management, Management Information Systems, and Non-Profit Institutional Management. Continuing Education Centers in Manchester, Portsmouth, and Salem, NH; New Brunswick, Maine; and Puerto Rico. 1,850 students.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE
Manchester, NH 03104
President: Sr. Jeannette Vezeau
Academic Dean: Sr. Frances Lessard

Women. Men accepted in selected programs. Independent. Catholic. Baccalaureate Degrees in Arts, Business Education, Education, Music and Science. B.S. in Medical Technology; Associate Degrees in Secretarial Sciences and in Child Care and Development. 348 students.

PLYMOUTH STATE COLLEGE
Plymouth, NH 03264
President: Dr. Harold Hyde
Academic Dean: Dr. John C. Foley

Coeducational. Associate Degrees in Business Management, Secretarial Science, Public Service, and in Biological Laboratory Science. Baccalaureate Degrees in Education, Liberal Arts, Business Administration. Master Degrees in Education and Business Administration. 2,540 students.

RIVIER COLLEGE
Nashua, NH 03060
President: Sr. Doris Benoit
Academic Dean: Sr. Roberta Croteau

Women. Private. Catholic. Degrees: A.A.; A.S. in Social Science, Business Administration, Medical Technology, Criminal Justice. B.A., B.B.A., B.F.A., B.S., M.A. in English, French, Social Science, Religious Education. M.B.A., M.Ed., M.S. in Biology and Medical Technology. 1,245 students.

ST. ANSELM'S COLLEGE
Manchester, NH 03102
President: Rev. Brendan P. Donnelly
Academic Dean: Rev. Placidus Riley

Coeducational. Catholic. Degrees: A.B.; B.S. in Nursing; A.S. and B.S. in Criminal Justice. Teacher training, Pre-professional. 1,741 students.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Durham, NH 03824
President: Dr. Eugene Mills
Academic Dean: Dr. David Ellis

Coeducational. Degrees Offered: A.A.S., A.A., B.A., B.F.A., B.S., B.M., B.S. in Forestry, M.A., M.A.T., M.S.T., M.B.A., M.P.A., M.Ed., M.S., Ph.D. Colleges of Life Sciences and Agriculture, Liberal Arts, Technology, Health Studies, Whittemore School of Business and Economics, and Thompson School of Applied Science. Graduate School. 9,900 students. MERRIMACK VALLEY BRANCH, Manchester: A.A. program for 1400 commuters; SCHOOL OF CONTINUING STUDIES: University system-wide effort in community education for non-traditional students.

References

Alexander, L.T., & Yelon, S.L. (Ed.) Instructional development agencies in higher education. East Lansing, Mich. Learning Service, Michigan State University, 1972.

Astin, A., & Lee, C. The invisible colleges: A profile of small colleges with limited resources. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bunnell, K.P., & Johnson, E.L. Interinstitutional cooperation. In S. Baskin (Ed.), Higher education: Some newer developments. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1965.

Cooperative Curriculum Project Committee, Cooperation in the curriculum, Manchester, N.H., New Hampshire College and University Council, 1974.

Diamond, R.M., Eickmann, P.E., Kelly, E.F., Holloway, R.E., Vickery, T.R., & Pascarella, E.T. Instructional development in higher education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty development in a time of retrenchment. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1974.

Grupe, F.H. The management of consortium priorities. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45, 135-144.

Grupe, F.H. Interinstitutional cooperation at the department level. Potsdam, N.Y.: Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, 1972.

Holsclaw, J.E. The development of procedural guidelines for the systematic design of instruction within higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974, No. 74-21, 479.

Johnson, E.L. Consortia in higher education. Educational Record, 1967, 48, 341-347.

Lichtman, J. Personal Correspondence, January 23, 1975.

Lyon, D.W., Long-distance instructional development. Staff memorandum, New Hampshire College and University Council, Manchester, N.H., 1974.

Moore, R.S. Consortiums in American higher education: 1965-66, Report of an exploratory study. Washington: Office of Education, OE # 50055, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1968.

Nelsen, W.C. Entrepreneurship and innovation in consortia. Journal of Higher Education, 1972, 43, 544-551.

New Hampshire College and University Council, Instructional development pilot project, staff memorandum, Author, Manchester, N.H., 1974.

Patterson, F.K. Colleges in consort. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Patterson, L.D. Consortia in American higher education, report 7., Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970, ED # 043-800.

Patterson, L.D. The potential of consortia, Compact, 1971, 5 (4), 19-22.

Patterson, L.D. Personal Correspondence, February 18, 1975.

Sarason, S.B. The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Schwenkenmeyer, B., & Goodman, M.E. Putting cooperation to work. New York: Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, 1972.

Swegan, D.B. Consortia colleges pool talent, dollars. College and University Business, 1972, 53 (2), 35-41.

Ullmer, E.J., & Stakenas, R.G. Instructional development handbook. Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, Division of Instructional Research and Service, Instructional Development Center, 1971.